

REMARKS

I. Amendment to the Claims

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-3, 6-15, and 17-28 are pending in the application. Of the pending claims, claims 1, 25, and 27 are independent. As discussed below, claims 1 and 25 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter from claim 16, and new claim 27 incorporates the allowable subject matter from claim 9. Claims 4, 5, and 16 have been cancelled.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 23 have been amended for reasons unrelated to patentability. The Office Action objected to these claims for containing certain informalities, and the claim amendments are merely to correct inadvertent informalities and errors in antecedent basis. It is respectfully submitted that claims 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, and 23 are entitled to their original claim scope and all equivalents.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected Claim Nos. 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In response, Applicant has cancelled claims 4 and 5.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner has rejected Claim Nos. 1-3, 7, 11-14, 19 and 21 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,611,981 (the “Lin” patent) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). In support of this ground

of rejection, the Examiner has concluded that Lin discloses all of the elements set forth in the claims. As discussed above, the foregoing claim amendments have incorporated allowable subject matter into Claim No. 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of Claim No. 1 and its dependent claims has been obviated and should now be withdrawn.

IV. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claim Nos. 4, 5 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lin in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,112,502 (the “Forsberg” patent). As noted above, claims 4 and 5 have been cancelled. Claim 15 depends from, and includes all of the limitations of, claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 15 is also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claim Nos. 6 and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,584 (the “Perez” patent). As for claims 6 and 24, these claims depend from, and include all of the limitations of, claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 6 and 24 are also in condition for allowance. As for claim 25, this claim has been amended to recite the limitation of: “mounting said pumping chamber and said cushion bladder within the folding seat.” As stated in the Office Action on page 8, “nor would it have been obvious at the time the invention was made to incorporate the apparatus of Lin ‘981 into a folding seat.” Thus, because this limitation is not taught or suggested by the cited references, Applicant

submits that claim 25 as amended is allowable. Because claim 26 depends from claim 25 and includes all the limitations thereof, claim 26 is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claim Nos. 8, 10, 18, 20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lin. Claims 8, 10, 18, 20 and 22 depend from, and include all of the limitations of, claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 8, 10, 18, 20 and 22 are also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claim Nos. 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,209,160 (the “Harris” patent). Claim 17 depends from, and includes all of the limitations of, claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 17 is also in condition for allowance.

The Examiner has rejected Claim Nos. 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Lin in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,133,696 (the “Mirando” patent). Claim 23 depends from, and includes all of the limitations of, claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter of claim 16. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 23 is also in condition for allowance.

V. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims are allowable over the prior art of record, including the cited references. For similar reasons, and for the additional reasons set forth above, Applicant urge that the dependent claims are also allowable.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes for any reason that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Applicant respectfully requests that the above amendments be entered and a Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,



By: David A. Chambers, Reg. No. 50,788
Husch & Eppenberger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-480-1867
314-480-1505 FAX